1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7	BEFORE THE PUBLIC DISC OF THE STATE OF	
8		
9	IN RE THE MATTER OF ENFORCEMENT	
10	ACTION AGAINST	PDC CASE NO. 02-286
11	DON BIVENS, MARILYN WESTLAKE,	
12	AND MARTY JAMES,	HEARING BRIEF OF RESPONDENT MARTY JAMES,
13	Respondents.	CLARK FIRE DISTRICT #5 ADMINISTRATOR
14		
15		
16	COMES NOW the Respondent Marty James	es, by and through his counsel, and
17	respectfully submits the following brief for the Co	mmission hearing scheduled on February 22,
18 19	2005 at 1:00 p.m.	
20	I. ALLEGATIONS AGAINST	T RESPONDENT JAMES
21	The staff has alleged that Mr. James has view	olated the provisions of RCW 42.17.130 by
22	the following limited conduct:	
23		ion, and approved the content of three issues
24	of a newsletter, <i>Lifeline</i> , and a fact sheet that "as a	group" promoted a February 2000 ballot
25	measure;	
26	B. That the cost of the newsletters was pa	id in part by Clark County Fire District #5;

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

- C. That the newsletters and fact sheet were not a fair and objective presentation of the facts;
- D. That "they" (the newsletters and fact sheet) contained promotional statements and inflammatory images.

Mr. James responds that the newsletters were a normal and regular part of the Fire District's efforts to provide information to persons residing within the District boundaries, and that the documents were not "promotional" or "inflammatory".

## II. FACTS AND CIRCUMSTANCES

The facts will show that, while the Vancouver Fire Department and Clark County Fire District #5 have a written agreement for provision of services in the greater Vancouver area since 1994, they are distinct and separate entities. The two have completely different staffing, management and facilities. The City of Vancouver Fire Department does not have any direct supervision or control over Mr. James; the Clark County Fire District has no control or supervision over Respondents Don Bivens or Marilyn Westlake. Mr. Bivens and Ms. Westlake are employees of the City of Vancouver, and the Vancouver Fire Department, only.

The numerous allegations against Mr. Bivens and Ms. Westlake regarding videos, use of City property, press releases, etc., even if true, cannot be attributed to Mr. James.

The fact is that the Clark County Fire District has a long history of publishing regular newsletters and brochures for the information and education of its constituents. This information was either ignored or disregarded by the Commission investigator, who makes no mention of it in her case log. As far back as 1985, the Fire District was publishing a regular newsletter, the *5 Alarmer*. Through the time of the 1994 consolidation with the Vancouver Fire Department, the District published twice yearly newsletters, *News at Five*.

25

26

After the consolidation with the City Fire Department, the District published *News at Five* on an annual basis through 1997. The publication was reduced to once a year because of budget constraints, and publication was cancelled in 1998 and 1999 due to lack of available funds.

The *News at Five* contained information, photographs, and articles about fire prevention and services. It also addressed issues of department funding, facilities, and staffing.

When Mr. James became the administrator for the Fire District in June, 2000, he believed that communication with the District's constituents was a priority. He had been an officer in the District's Fire Department before 1994, and was aware of the public support for fire services that resulted from regular contact and information. Mr. James believed that it was important to renew those contacts and resumed publication of *News at Five*, as well as a new joint publication with the City Fire Department, *Lifeline*. Since 2000, *News at Five* has been published once a year by the District, except for 2004. In 2004, a special publication was created to acknowledge the District's 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary, which was titled *50 Years of Five*.

When Mr. James approached Chief Bivens in the summer of 2000 about producing and publishing a joint publication in 2000, it was not directly related to supporting a levy ballot measure. Since 1994, the demand for fire services had raised sharply, and this included a disproportionate amount of call for medical emergency services rather than a "fire" response. Unfortunately the resources, staffing and facilities to address these needs had not kept pace with the demand. These facts were not debatable, and presented a challenge to both the City and Fire District.

Whatever solution was developed to address these needs, Mr. James knew that the public would have to be informed of current needs and possible solutions. With that in mind, he proposed a regular joint publication for the District and the City Fire Department, which became the *Lifeline*. An agreement was reached for funding the publication on an alternate issue basis prior to any decision for specific content, levy funding, or a February ballot issue.

In Mr. James' mind, it was to be a supplement to *News at 5* that would reach all constituents within the joint service area, providing them with information related to fire protection and services. There was no written agreement regarding the publication of the *Lifeline*, and it was to be created on an informal basis.

As it developed, the *Lifeline* issues were written, edited, reviewed and published by the staff at the City Fire Department. Mr. James did not write any of the articles or include any letters from himself or the Fire District. While the District had a probable "veto power" for any particular issue, it was limited to a review of final product.

It was Mr. James' information and belief that the City had taken appropriate measures prior to publishing *Lifeline* issues to insure compliance with all related laws, including review and approval of by staff at the City attorney's office.

Mr. James did review the issues prior to their publication and did not find them to be inflammatory or promotional. The issues presented an accurate assessment of the service levels, response data, and projected remedies to address the problems facing both the City and District fire services. The issues of Lifeline were created and published one at a time, not "as a group" and Mr. James did not review them "as a group" prior to their publication. Mr. James took reasonable and good faith efforts to comply with the statute.

## III. AUTHORITIES

The allegations against Mr. James are based upon an application of RCW 42.17.130. As the Commission knows, the statute prohibits the authorization or use of "any of the facilities of a public office or agency..." for the purpose of promotion of "...any ballot proposition." *RCW 42.17.130* However, the statute and related provisions of the Washington Administrative Code provide that the statute does not apply to action which "...are part of the normal and regular conduct of the office or agency." *RCW 42.17.130(3; WAC 390-05-271(b)* 

Mr. James involvement with the publication of *Lifeline* was within the normal and regular conduct of his office and the past practice of Fire District #5.

1	The Commission has recognized that it is the right and the responsibility of local
2	government "to inform the general public of the operational and maintenance issues facing
3	local agencies." PDC Guidelines 04-02
4	From the standpoint of District #5 and Mr. James, the publication of the <i>Lifeline</i> issues
5	and the Fact Sheet were information to the public which addressed the issues and potential
6	solutions to the pressing operational and maintenance issues facing the fire services.
7	
8	For all of the reasons stated above, the Public Disclosure Commission should dismiss
9	the Administrative Charges against Mr. Marty James.
10	
11	Respectfully Submitted this 10 <sup>th</sup> day of February, 2005.
12	
13	Thomas Burke WSBA# 6577
14	Attorney for Respondent Marty James
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25 26	
/n	